

From: [Turner, Philip](#)
To: [Miller, Garyg](#)
Subject: RE: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS
Date: Monday, June 30, 2014 12:02:49 PM

There are PCLs for fishing... Recreational Fisher and Subsistence Fisher (although the subsistence fisher was not carried forward in the FS). I wonder If fish from these other site were contaminated by dioxins of a single source. San Jac fish have accumulated stuff from all over the watershed.

From: Miller, Garyg
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 7:57 AM
To: Turner, Philip
Subject: Steve Ells Comment on San Jacinto FS

Phil,

Below is a comment the Steve Ells made regarding the San Jacinto cleanup level – can you prepare a response?

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

5 – Why is the sediment PCL of 220 ppt based on a recreational visitor scenario? It is very high compared to other sites. At all dioxin sites, the cleanup level or remediation goal is much lower for fish consumption. There is an RAO for fish consumption, but no corresponding PCL or RG. At Centredale Manor it was 15 ppt, and at the Passaic River, the Proposed Plan used 7.1; both were based on a HI of 1. The risk-based protective concentration in fish tissue at the Passaic is 1.4 ppt. The current conc. of dioxins in fish should be stated, as well as the baseline risk that exposure pathway represents.



9561550